

Johnson (GA)	Miller, George	Scott (VA)
Johnson (IL)	Mitchell	Serrano
Johnson, E. B.	Mollohan	Sestak
Jones (OH)	Moore (KS)	Shays
Kagen	Moore (WI)	Shea-Porter
Kanjorski	Moran (KS)	Sherman
Kaptur	Moran (VA)	Shimkus
Kennedy	Murphy (CT)	Shuler
Kildee	Murphy, Patrick	Sires
Kilpatrick	Murphy, Tim	Skelton
Kind	Murtha	Slaughter
King (NY)	Nadler	Smith (NJ)
Kirk	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Klein (FL)	Neal (MA)	Snyder
Knollenberg	Obey	Solis
Kucinich	Olver	Space
Kuhl (NY)	Ortiz	Spratt
LaHood	Pallone	Stark
Lampson	Pascarell	Stupak
Langevin	Pastor	Sutton
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Tanner
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Tauscher
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Taylor
LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Platts	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Pomeroy	Tierney
Lewis (GA)	Porter	Towns
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Tsongas
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Turner
Loebuck	Rahall	Udall (CO)
Lofgren, Zoe	Ramstad	Udall (NM)
Lowe	Reichert	Upton
Lynch	Reyes	Van Hollen
Mahoney (FL)	Reynolds	Velázquez
Maloney (NY)	Richardson	Visclosky
Markey	Rodriguez	Walsh (NY)
Marshall	Rogers (AL)	Walz (MN)
Matheson	Ros-Lehtinen	Wasserman
Matsui	Ross	Schultz
McCarthy (NY)	Rothman	Watson
McCauley (TX)	Roybal-Allard	Watt
McCollum (MN)	Ruppersberger	Waxman
McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Weiner
McGovern	Salazar	Welch (VT)
McHugh	Sánchez, Linda	Wexler
McIntyre	T.	Wilson (OH)
McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Wittman (VA)
McNulty	Sarbanes	Wolf
Meek (FL)	Saxton	Wu
Meeks (NY)	Schakowsky	Wynn
Melancon	Schiff	Yarmuth
Michaud	Schwartz	
Miller (NC)	Scott (GA)	

NAYS—140

Aderholt	Feeney	McHenry
Akin	Flake	McMorris
Alexander	Forbes	Rodgers
Bachmann	Fossella	Mica
Barrett (SC)	Fox	Miller (FL)
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)
Barton (TX)	Galleghy	Miller, Gary
Bilbray	Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave
Bishop (UT)	Gingrey	Myrick
Blackburn	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Blunt	Goode	Nunes
Boehner	Goodlatte	Paul
Bonner	Granger	Pearce
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	Pence
Broun (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Brown (SC)	Hayes	Pickering
Brown-Waite,	Heller	Pitts
Ginny	Hensarling	Poe
Burgess	Herger	Price (GA)
Burton (IN)	Hobson	Putnam
Buyer	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Calvert	Hunter	Regula
Camp (MI)	Inglis (SC)	Rehberg
Campbell (CA)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Cantor	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Carter	Jordan	Roskam
Chabot	Keller	Royce
Coble	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Cole (OK)	Kingston	Sali
Conaway	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Cubin	Latta	Sessions
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Davis, David	Lucas	Simpson
Davis, Tom	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NE)
Deal (GA)	E.	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	Mack	Souder
Drake	Manzullo	Stearns
Dreier	Marchant	Sullivan
Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Everett	McCotter	Thornberry
Fallin	McCrery	Tiahrt

Tiberi	Weldon (FL)	Wilson (NM)
Walberg	Weller	Wilson (SC)
Walden (OR)	Westmoreland	Young (FL)
Wamp	Whitfield (KY)	

NOT VOTING—12

Gutierrez	Oberstar	Tancredo
Hooey	Rangel	Waters
Linder	Renzi	Woolsey
McKeon	Rush	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1507

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, before we resolve into the Committee of the Whole, I ask unanimous consent that Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and submit matters relevant to consideration of H. Con. Res. 312, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1036 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 312.

□ 1511

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON). The gentleman from

South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 90 minutes on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 14 minutes.

Madam Chairman, today we take up the budget resolution. Passing it, like many things in this House, is never easy, and sometimes contentious. But it is crucially important if we care about fiscal soundness and the future of our country.

Our country faces right now a host of different challenges: the specter of recession, a crunch in the credit markets, rising unemployment, declining family income, constant inflation in the cost of health care, aging infrastructure, and a porous safety net. And that is not to mention the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, costing us close to \$200 billion this year, and even more dearly in human lives and wounded.

The President's budget for 2009 does little to turn this tide. In fact, the policies of the last 7 years have created some of these problems and compounded others. Eight short years ago, in 2000, our budget was in surplus, big-time surplus. In that year, we had a surplus of \$236 billion. Having worked for years to bring the budget to this status, we warned the President and our colleagues across the aisle not to bet it all on a blue-sky forecast; but it was to no avail.

The President's economists looked out 10 years and saw nothing but surpluses, \$5.6 trillion in all. We worried that if these rosy projections didn't pan out, we would be right back where we had been, deep in deficit.

□ 1515

Well, the President told the country, in effect, that we could have it all, guns, butter and tax cuts, too, and never mind the deficits.

I'll have to admit it looked as though we were sitting on an island of surpluses, but, in truth, we were surrounded by a sea of debt, of long-term unfunded liabilities for Social Security and Medicare, coming due just over the horizon.

Seven years later, under this administration's policies, those surpluses are history. They're gone, vanished, replaced with record deficits and mounting debt.

This one chart here which shows in tabular form the increase in the debt over the last 8 years, says it as simply as we can on one piece of paper. When the President came to office, the debt of this country was \$5.7 trillion. When he leaves in a few months, it will probably be close to \$10 trillion, more than \$4 trillion in debt accumulation on the watch of the Bush administration.

The budget we take up today is no grand solution, I'll grant you that, but it moves us in the right direction. It restores fiscal responsibility, but not to the exclusion of other values that

we hold dear such as our children's education and their good health care. And that's why, right off the bat, we part company with the President's budget and with Mr. RYAN's substitute.

We think Medicare is one of our country's crowning achievements, so we reject his cuts that would emasculate Medicare, in the President's budget, \$556 billion over 10 years, and we reject his cuts in Medicaid, \$118 billion over 10 years.

The Ryan substitute over 5 years would cut Medicare by \$253 billion by our calculation, and Medicaid by \$116 billion. We can't vote for that.

We would not wipe out the Social Services Block Grant or cripple the Community Services Block Grants as the President proposes, because we have seen in our own communities the roles they play. They hold up the safety net in an economy where it's sorely needed. And with fuel prices at record highs, the last thing we would slash is LIHEAP and low-income home weatherization. These are minimum benefits for Americans with maximum needs.

Ten years ago when we first ran a surplus, we resolved in both Houses to use some of that surplus each year to double the resources of the National Institutes of Health, the NIH, over a period of 5 years. We reached that goal in a bipartisan way, only to backslide year by year in this administration. In our budget this year we stop the backsliding at NIH, and we restore the President's cuts at the equally important Centers For Disease Control.

Our budget targets other resources to strengthen our economy and our society. We invest more in innovation, more in energy, more in infrastructure, and we provide \$7.1 billion more than the President for education.

To move our country one step closer to health care for all, we facilitate up to \$50 billion to expand SCHIP, the children's health insurance program, consistent with PAYGO, requiring that the costs be fully offset. We also accommodate fiscally responsible relief from the alternative minimum tax in order to shelter those middle-income taxpayers for whom it was never intended.

To make America safe, we fully fund defense, and we keep our promises to those who have fought for our defense, providing \$3.6 billion above current services for veterans health care.

Now Mr. RYAN puts another billion on top of that in his budget, but he also puts in function 920, this is budget esoterica, but he puts in function 920 a call for \$400 billion in undistributed cuts. One of those cuts would likely be that apparent increase in veterans health care.

Although we fix the AMT for another year, providing a tax cut of \$70 billion to middle-income Americans, our Republican colleagues will accuse us of raising taxes. You've already heard it. The fact is, our budget doesn't raise taxes by one penny. But don't take my word for it. Stop by the manager's

table right here on the House floor and read the letters that we've received from groups like the Concord Coalition, or look at the posters that we just posted here.

Here's what the Concord Coalition says: "Allowing some or all of the tax cuts to expire would not be the result of Congress raising taxes; it would be the result of sunsets that were included when these tax cuts were originally enacted to avoid the level of fiscal scrutiny that PAYGO is designed to ensure." That's what the Concord Coalition has to say about our resolution.

If you want to see more, turn to section 501 in our budget resolution, title 5, section 501, and we enumerate, from item A through H, child tax credit, marital penalty relief, the 10 percent bracket, estate taxes, extension of research experimentation tax credit, extension of the State and local sales tax deduction, extension of the deduction for small business expenses and it goes on. These are the tax cuts that we embrace and commit ourselves to seeing renewed when they do eventually expire.

We believe that tax relief can come in a deficit-neutral tax bill in some cases, and we offer the AMT as an example. On more than one occasion, high-ranking officials in the Bush administration have testified before our committee, and when they're asked about the AMT and its impact on middle-income taxpayers, they've insisted that they could fix the AMT with changes in the Tax Code so that there would be no net loss of revenues.

For example, in February 2006 Josh Bolten was the director of OMB. He told our committee that the AMT could be corrected in the context of overall deficit-neutral tax reform, his words.

In February 2007, his successor, Rob Portman, told the Budget Committee, "Our budget assumes it will have a revenue-neutral correction to the AMT."

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, has taken the same stance, but Mr. RANGEL has delivered. He's put a revenue-neutral bill on the table to kindle the debate. The Bush administration asserts it too has a plan, but has failed to follow through by disclosing any plan of its own.

One of the first steps that we took in the 110th Congress was to restore the pay-as-you-go rules that had helped us in the 1990s turn record deficits into record surpluses. This resolution fully complies with the PAYGO rule.

Partly because we've held mandatory spending in check with PAYGO and, at the same time, kept domestic discretionary spending close to the rate of inflation, this budget returns to surplus in 2012. Our bottom line beats the President's budget going away. Between 2009 and 2013, our net deficits are \$262 billion. Over the same period the President's net deficits are \$674 billion. And using CBO's latest forecast, our budget should be in surplus by 2012 in the amount of \$178 billion. And from

2012 through 2018 our cumulative surplus should reach \$1.4 trillion, all told.

Now we could have used the lion's share of those surpluses to offset the revenues lost to renewal of expiring tax cuts, and surpluses of \$1.4 trillion would indeed offset a huge amount of revenues forgone. We chose instead to leave those decisions to a time closer to December 31, 2010, when the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts expire. But when the time is right, if those surpluses materialize, they can be used to offset the renewal of numerous expiring tax cuts, disproving our opponents' claim that we don't intend to renew and extend any of the expiring cuts.

In our resolution we also provide \$940 million for program integrity, much of it going to the Internal Revenue Service for audits and compliance. The Commissioner told us not so many months ago that there's a huge tax gap, maybe \$500 billion, between taxes owed and taxes paid, the so-called tax gap. If we can close that gap just a bit, we can raise tax revenues without raising tax rates. These funds can likewise be used as offsets.

So there are many ways to look at tax cuts in the code. And what we are saying here is that we should use the next several years, before the tax cuts expire, to do all of the above so that we will have the revenues to renew many of these tax cuts and restructure the AMT in keeping with PAYGO principles. That's simply what we are proposing.

Our budget parallels the President's budget with respect to national defense. It funds the basic defense budget at the levels the President requested for 5 years, but does not include supplemental funds beyond the \$700 billion sought by the President. The President's budget for 2009 does include a \$70 billion item which the Pentagon calls a placeholder. To compare our budget to the President's budget, apples to apples, our resolution includes a \$70 billion placeholder equal to the President's request for overseas deployments and activities in theaters that include Afghanistan and Iraq. This budget resolution is not an authorization bill. It's not an appropriations bill, and therefore, it cannot prescribe how much should be spent for these activities or specify where the funds should be spent. Those decisions are left to the authorization and appropriation process, in committee and on this floor. These funds, however, can be used for whatever purpose the Congress eventually chooses in authorizing and appropriating legislation.

When we set out to do this budget, our overriding objective, Madam Chairman, was a balanced budget, because we're appalled at the amount of debt being left our children, and at our stature in the world as the greatest debtor nation. But we want more than arithmetic balance; we want our priorities balanced; we want a budget that does more for our children's education and their health care as well, a budget that

makes our workers more competitive and our scientists more innovative.

We want to revive America, restore our fiscal soundness, reclaim our future. This budget is just one step, but it's one step in the right direction.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 12½ minutes.

Madam Chairman, in many ways I believe our two parties agree on many things. We both agree on the need to balance the budget. We agree on the need for solid, sustained economic growth that produces an abundance of good-paying American jobs. And we agree that the looming entitlement crisis is the greatest threat to our Nation's economic and budgetary future.

But as this budget makes clear, there is a glaring disagreement on how best to achieve these goals, or as in the case of entitlements, even to address this challenge.

Republicans believe that the best America is an America free from the burden of Big Government. We believe that the nucleus of our society, the engine of economic growth in this country, is the individual, the family, the entrepreneur, not the government. And we believe that the more the Federal Government expands demands and takes from these citizens, the less freedom they will have and the less opportunity to realize their own potential.

Clearly, the Democrats have a much different philosophy. They believe that bigger government is better government, and they believe that the best way, the only way to meet our Nation's myriad challenges is with an ever larger Federal Government fueled by even higher spending, financed by ever higher taxes. With this budget, the Democrats have proven their commitment to this philosophy. And as it did last year, the first thing this budget does is tout a whole lot of new spending for, as we heard in last week's speeches and press conferences and as we heard today, for everyone and everything.

But right next to this budget's much hyped new spending priorities and promises are somewhat less advertised big new tax hikes on American workers, families and small businesses, many of whom are already struggling to make ends meet.

In recent months, we've seen a whole host of legitimate concerns in the economy. Growth and job creation are slowing, and many Americans are seeing their home values falling. At the same time their food, energy and health care bills are going up. The worst thing we could do to these families or the struggling economy is raise taxes. But if we pass this budget, that's exactly what we will be doing. Passing this budget means imposing on the economy and on our constituents the largest tax increase in American history.

One of the most ironic things about the Democrats' tax increase is that it comes on the heels of this bipartisan

economic stimulus plan. Just last month, Congress passed a stimulus package to give struggling families some of their tax dollars back and provide incentives for businesses to expand and create jobs. But before we could even get these checks out the door, the Democrats unveiled this budget that will take all that money back plus demand hundreds of billions more new higher taxes. Far from consistent tax policy, that's not even coherent tax policy. Is \$600 really going to make a difference to somebody in Janesville, Wisconsin with a tax increase of nearly \$3,000 per year looming on the horizon? Does a one-time check of \$1,200 really make up for later raising taxes on that same family of four by \$6,000 each and every year?

This budget will raise marginal tax rates on all income taxpayers, including low-income individuals who are benefitting from the 10 percent bracket. This budget will slash the \$1,000 per child tax credit in half. It will reinstate the marriage tax penalty. It will make it that much harder for families to pay their mortgages, pay their grocery bills and send their kids to college.

□ 1530

Unlike the Democrats' rhetoric would have you believe, we are not just talking about hurting rich people. I know a whole lot of people back in Wisconsin who paid taxes, who are married and who have kids who do not consider themselves anything close to rich. But this budget's tax cuts will hit every single American taxpayer, whether or not they checked some imaginary "rich" box on their tax form.

Now, again, my friends on the other side of the aisle insist this isn't their plan, that they're really not going to raise your taxes. They've got all of these groups from the left saying that's not happening. But yet they keep writing those tax hikes in their budget. Why? Because their numbers would never work. Their budget would never show balance. And without those massive tax hikes, this budget requires, includes, assumes, mandates a \$683 billion tax increase over just 5 years.

First, because it exhumes the complete expiration of the 2001 and 2003 tax laws. And because of their own PAYGO rule, just to continue those same laws which are already in place, they're required to offset those current provisions with an equal tax increase of \$683 billion. So whatever way you cut it, you can't avoid it. It is a tax increase, a big one, the biggest we've ever seen.

And second, because they're already committed, every one of those tax dollars, to pay for their new spending. Beyond admitting the burden these tax hikes will put on our constituents and the economy, this Congress has got to understand that we will never rid our government of deficits and debt by simply raising taxes.

Our problem has never been that Americans aren't sending enough of

their taxpayer dollars to Washington. Our problem has always been, and is clearly today, that Washington is spending too much money and far too quickly to be sustained.

But for all of the Democrats' purported concern about the deficit, all they've chosen to do since they came into the majority is spend more and more money. This year's budget would certainly continue that trend. The Democrats' budget proposes to increase entitlement spending by untold amounts of the use of numerous reserve funds. At the same time, they want to increase nonsecurity discretionary spending by more than \$22 billion over the President's request.

But even while demanding billings and new spending, they fail to do anything to reduce the wasteful spending already included in these budgets. In fact, last year, the majority's appropriations bill included over 11,000 earmarks at a cost of nearly \$15 billion to taxpayers.

This year, the majority has already rejected Republican calls for an earmark moratorium or even earmark reform to reduce the wasteful, self-serving spending. In this regard, we can expect more of the same; another year and another choice by the majority of pork over paychecks. But for all of the additional spending, the worst thing that is not in this budget is not what it does, but the many things it fails to do.

First, I think it's fair to note that if we apply the Democrats' own standards, this budget doesn't even achieve balance. That's because this budget suffers from the same shortcomings that the Democrats criticized the President's budget for doing just weeks ago.

This budget doesn't pay for the AMT fix and it doesn't pay for the war, as the chairman so eloquently criticized the Bush budget just a couple weeks ago. As a result, this chart shows that this budget doesn't really balance in 2012; instead, it remains in the red for as far as the eye can see.

Finally, for the second straight year, the majority budget fails to include even one meaningful reform to address our entitlement crisis. This means that even if this budget were to balance in 2012, it would be quickly driven right back into deficit by these programs' current path of growth. By ignoring this problem, this budget ignores every one of the witnesses we've called before the Budget Committee who have warned that our largest entitlement programs, particularly Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, simply cannot be sustained as currently structured.

These experts have told us unequivocally that if we fail to reform these programs, not only will they grow themselves right into extinction, they will impose a crushing burden on our debt, on our budget, and all but eliminate our Nation's ability to compete in the global marketplace.

Our Nation's chief accountant, GAO Comptroller General Walker, recently

testified that the long-term fiscal obligation of the U.S. Government is \$53 trillion, or about \$180,000 in unfunded liability for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is \$180,000 per person. You can buy really nice homes in Wisconsin for \$180,000.

And we know that this problem, once dismissed as somewhere off in the future, is already upon us. On February 12 of this year, last month, the first baby boomer, a retired teacher from Maryland, received her first Social Security check. And right on her heels are over 80 million other baby boomers who will qualify for both Social Security and Medicare right after her. And just last month, the Medicare trigger was set off sending a clear warning shot to Congress that we must act immediately to get this program on a sustainable path.

In fact, by doing nothing, by ignoring this problem for another 5 years, the Democrats' budget will add another \$14 trillion in unfunded liability for future generations. And this is just in the next 5 years. Over the long run, the problem will grow much worse than that.

As this chart shows, by the year 2040, our three largest entitlement programs alone will consume 20 percent of our economy, equivalent to the cost of the entire Federal Government today. By this time, the overall size of government will consume 40 percent of our Nation's GDP, more than double the historic average of 18.3 percent.

What that means in real life is my three children, who are 3, 4, and 6 years old, by the time they are exactly my age, they will have to pay twice the level of taxes we pay today just to keep today's Federal Government afloat for them at that time. Add no new programs and take none away, for my three kids, when they are my age, they will have to bear twice the burden we bear today just to pay the bills of the Federal Government before they can keep any money left in their own paychecks.

The only choice we would leave them would be to pay the crippling tax burden or simply accept the fact that their Nation can no longer afford health care, education, or even defense or national security. I can't imagine any one of us who finds that kind of future acceptable, but this is exactly what this budget confines them to do.

Everyone talks about this common entitlement as our greatest challenge, and rightfully so, but it is also our greatest opportunity. Today, with this budget, we have an opportunity to save our largest retirement and health safety net programs from financial ruin. We can make these programs better, stronger, more responsive, more resilient, more sustainable, and more in line with the way our economy works today.

And if we act now, we have the opportunity to make these reforms in a rational, well-thought-out way. We don't have to wait for the crisis to hit.

But regrettably, that's exactly what the Democratic majority would have us do. With this budget, they are simply accepting that we are going to continue to pile up massive amounts of debt for our children and we are going to force them to pay double what we do in taxes to keep these programs afloat in the future.

In closing, let me say that I have come to know and respect many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. In particular, I think the gentleman from South Carolina is the definition of a true Southern gentleman. He's a class-act man, and I don't have any doubt in my mind that every one of them on the other side of the aisle are just as well intentioned and just as concerned about our Nation's future as anyone is on this side of the aisle.

Every one of us wants our Nation to remain strong, safe, prosperous, and free today and well into the future. Every one of us wants to pass on to the next generation a world that is even better than the one our parents gave us. By giving us these jobs, by sending us to Congress, that's exactly what our constituents entrusted us to do.

With that great responsibility in mind, I will be opposing this budget that we are considering today. This budget misses an historic opportunity to put our Nation on a better path. Instead, they choose the path of Big Government, higher spending, higher taxes, higher debt. I can only hope that this Congress will choose to change its course before it's too late, because if we fail, we may be the first generation to sever that precious, fragile American legacy of leaving a better standard of living for future generations.

With that, Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Chairman, before I talk about how this budget will help keep America secure, let me just respond by saying I'm glad we live in a country where speech is free. But when I hear my Republican colleagues talk about the burden of crushing debt as they try to attack our budget this year, I would remind the American people that these were the architects of \$4 trillion in national debt over the last 8 years; \$4 trillion of national debt that will lead to an annual tax of \$188 billion on my children until the day they die just to pay interest on the debt they created in the last 4 years with their partisan budgets.

Madam Chairman, keeping America safe and secure should always be a top national priority. That's why, with this budget, House Democrats provide for a strong national defense and invest billions more on homeland security, veterans health care than the President's budget request.

Here are 10 reasons why this budget helps keep America safe and secure:

First, it increases the national defense budget by \$37.5 billion over last

year to a 7.5 percent increase, excluding costs for wars in Iraq and Afghanistan;

Second, this budget will improve military readiness, especially for the National Guard and Reserves;

Third, we say "no" to the administration's ill-advised cuts of \$430 million in programs to protect Americans from the threat of nuclear terrorism;

Fourth, this budget provides funds to implement the 9/11 Commission recommendations, such as better screening of cargo and passenger aircraft and ship containers coming from foreign seaports;

Fifth, we say "no" to the administration's proposed billion dollars in cuts for first responders such as firefighters and police officers;

Sixth, the Democratic budget rejects the administration's proposal to cut \$705 million from the State's Homeland Security grant program;

Seventh, we actually fund the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, in contrast to the administration, which zeroes out this program which helps communities incarcerate illegal criminal aliens;

Eighth, the Democratic budget increases veterans health care and benefits by \$3.2 billion above the President's request. We believe our Nation should keep its promises to those who've kept their promise to serve. The fact is, with this budget, in 2 years, the Democratic-led Congress will have increased veterans funding by more than the Republican-led Congress did in 12 years;

Ninth, the Military Officers Association of America, MOAA, applauds this bill for honoring our military troops and retirees by replacing the administration's \$1.2 billion shortfall in defense health care and for rejecting massive fee increases to the military TRICARE health program;

Tenth, and finally, the DAV, American Legion, AMVETS, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and numerous other veterans organizations respected across our land have applauded what this bill does for veterans. Listen to what the executive director of the Veterans for Foreign Wars said about the budget bill we passed last year and this one: It is an unparalleled commitment to veterans service and sacrifice.

Madam Chairman, I think that says it well.

At this time, I would like to recognize and yield to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), who's been a tireless champion of America's veterans.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, we have an administration that says support the troops, support the troops, support the troops. Then they give us the budget that cuts support for veterans over the next 5 years, year by year by year, and with a modest increase for health care that barely covers inflation. It cut every single account in the veterans budget, including

construction, including research, all of the way through. So we restore, if I'm correct, Mr. EDWARDS, we restore all of those cuts.

And for the seventh year in a row, the President said, Let's increase enrollment fees. Let's double the pharmaceutical copays, and we, for the seventh year in a row are saying "no." But not only did they increase the fees, they made a calculation that several hundred thousand veterans would not be able to pay those fees and be thrown out of the health care system. That, in a time of war where we got our troops fighting, they're going to throw veterans out of the VA health care system. That is disgraceful, and we said "no" to that.

And I thank the gentleman for making sure that we respected these warriors. It's part of the cost of war to treat the veterans correctly. Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. SPRATT, you provided for those veterans. The whole country thanks you.

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Chairman, at this point, for engaging in a colloquy, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE.)

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Chairman, I'm proud of this budget because it continues on the great work that we did last year after years and years of chronic underfunding of the veterans health care system. We added \$13 billion in funding for the VA, which is the largest increase in the 77-year history of the VA, and that was great work. And we are following that up this year by adding \$4.9 billion in increased funding and including steady increases over each of the next 5 years.

□ 1545

This budget is true to our American veterans.

In contrast, the President's budget, which does include a modest \$1.7 billion increase this year, it decreases funding in real dollars over the next 4 years, and over the 5-year period, contains a cut in veterans health care spending. And there are 120,000 new veterans entering the system this year. Is there anyone in this body that thinks that health care costs aren't going to go up, that the number of veterans isn't going to go up, people entering the VA health care system? And instead of following the President's lead and cutting veterans health care spending, we're increasing spending to the largest levels in history.

It's endorsed by the VFW, the American Legion, the Vietnam Veterans of America, just to name a few. And this funding means that we're going to clear up the 500,000 case backlog that currently exists in the VA due to that chronic underfunding that took place over the past several years before we increased funding last year. It's going to make improvements at VA clinics, help keep up with growing populations of veterans, including in my home district a \$180 million expansion of the VA health care facility.

It's going to increase research on traumatic brain injury and prosthetics to help our wounded warriors and our wounded veterans. It's going to help us recruit and retain the highest quality health care professionals to ensure that our veterans get nothing less than the highest quality health care available anywhere in the country right at our VA centers.

So, lastly I would say to the gentleman, we have stepped up to the plate. We are going to support our veterans not just with our words, but with our actions. We're going to continue the great work we did last year with a \$4.9 billion increase this year.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for his words and his actions in this Congress on behalf of our Nation's veterans and veterans in your district.

It is now my privilege to yield to Congresswoman BOYDA, the gentlelady from Kansas, for purposes of a colloquy. And I want to thank her for working so hard on behalf of our troops, their families, and our veterans and their families.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It has been a pleasure to work with you on behalf of our active duty military and the two VA hospitals that we have in the Second District of Kansas. It's such an important issue for so many people in my district, and they want to know that somebody is fighting for them.

I would just say that it's almost laughable if it weren't so sad to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin talk about this debt as if for the last 7 years we haven't seen a tremendous increase in our national debt.

I, too, am absolutely worried sick about the fact that my children are going to have to pay the \$4 trillion of debt that we've incurred since they've been in the majority, or actually, in the last 7 years. But Mr. Chairman, let me just say that what makes me feel so good about this new majority and this budget that we've brought forward, in those years since we've seen that increase in debt that's going to be so devastating to us, what have we gotten for it? In 12 years, we've seen the debt double, and yet we only saw \$16 billion go into veterans benefits at a time when they needed them so badly. In the last year, with our fiscally responsible budget, we will have added in the last 2 years \$17 billion. It's just a matter of priorities.

We all are very concerned about the budget deficit that the Republicans have just escalated beyond control. You and I are working together to make sure that we have priorities that reflect the priorities of the American people. Since 2003, the backlog has increased by 50 percent. We have cut so much funding out. And so, thank God that we have put some of this money back in.

And I know the people of Kansas want to make sure that the money

they are sending to Washington, D.C. is used well and is used for the veterans that have gone out and fought so bravely for our country.

Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased to be a strong supporter of this budget and a strong supporter of the veterans. It's easy, very easy to put a yellow ribbon on your car. And I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just spoke, we need to have action, not just words.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentlelady from Kansas for your powerful advocacy on behalf of our veterans and our military.

I would now like to recognize and yield for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas for the opportunity to engage in this colloquy. Thank you, Mr. EDWARDS.

It is sort of ironic that under the previous Congresses, their idea of fiscal discipline was to raise the debt ceiling to \$9 trillion, I find that interesting, while at the same time we have seen homeland security funding only being paid lip service to and not really being taken care of.

As you know, nine out of 10 Americans live in areas that are prone to natural disasters, and of course we're not prepared to take care of them. The Coast Guard itself said that we are only 25 percent along the way to meeting the needs to protect our ports, that 75 percent of those needs have gone unmet in homeland security.

We can fulfill the 9/11 Commission requests here, H.R. 1, take care of those funding priorities that make us all safer.

The cuts to first responders I can't believe. I worked my way through college, actually, as a paramedic/EMT back in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. It's unconscionable the kinds of cuts that have been done. The State Homeland Security grants, I just want to make a quick list here, the administration cut it by \$705 million. The Urban Area Security Initiative, cut by \$9 million. Fire grants, the very grants that protect us in the rural areas, cut by \$463 million by the administration. The Byrne Justice Assistance Grants, zeroed out, eliminated entirely. The COPS program, cut by \$599 million. We make sure we put \$417 million back into the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, the administration zeroed that out, the very program that enables local communities to handle undocumented criminals that they capture.

Finally, the President's budget only funds \$210 million of the \$400 million authorized to make sure the Coast Guard takes care of our ports. This is irresponsible, never mind unconscionable.

I'm proud of this budget. This budget goes a long way towards protecting this country, a lot further than previous budgets.

Thank you, Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for pointing out that it takes budgets to defend our Nation, our communities and our families, not just rhetoric.

At this time I would like to recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) for a colloquy. And I want to thank the gentleman for his year-in, year-out work on behalf of our servicemen and -women, their families and our veterans.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I want to personally thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership throughout the country and your efforts in providing for our veterans.

I know I had the pleasure of serving on the Veterans Committee, and nothing was more frustrating than during the period of time that I served to just give nothing but lip service, and at the same time see the major cuts of the administration when it came to our veterans after having served our country. When I saw the budgets of the administration continuously bring forth additional fees and copayments on our veterans when both sides were saying that that was not appropriate, he continues to do that with this present budget. And if that was not enough, I know that he cut priority 8 veterans. And I'm glad to see that this budget includes that on there, so I want to personally thank you for that.

In addition, the Democratic budget calls for advance pay and benefits to improve the quality of life of our troops and their families, including the emphasis on providing support and assistance to our troops and their families while they are deployed. And that is essential. It's unfortunate, and we cannot even comprehend how this has come about.

Let me just say, this budget also calls for a \$15.9 billion cut for the next 5 years on our soldiers, on TRICARE. As it is, the reimbursements on TRICARE are real low, to the point that some of our doctors are not going to take some of those soldiers and provide access to health care that they need.

But I want to take this opportunity to thank the chairman and the leadership on this budget effort for making sure that our troops have the resources that are necessary, and to make sure that our veterans, after they come back, have the services that they're entitled to. We need to push forth on making sure those polytrauma centers get built so that access to health care is essential.

Thank you very much for this colloquy.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this Budget resolution. This budget provides for among many other elements the much needed resources for our country's defense needs.

As you know, I represent a very large district that spans from San Antonio in the east to El Paso County in the west and south to the Mexico border. The U.S. military is very

important to my district as evidenced by the BRAC decisions that centralize military medical training in San Antonio and bring soldiers from Europe back to Fort Bliss in El Paso. While the defense budget is important to the Nation as a whole, it has a particularly strong significance to my constituents.

EXCELLENT AND AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE

San Antonio is poised to be the military center of excellence for medical issues with the completion of the current BRAC construction.

The President's budget calls for increases in Tri-care fees for military retirees under the age of 65 by \$15.9 billion over five years.

The military's own have opposed these fees as evidenced by the Military Offices' Association of America's rejection of the fee increases.

MOAA supports the Democratic budget that avoids Tri-care fee hikes and places a continued emphasis on addressing problems such as those identified at Walter Reed Medical Center.

READINESS

The Commission on the Guard and Reserve issued a report on January 30, 2008 citing a lack of readiness to respond to a catastrophic attack on the United States.

A major reason for this is the Administration budget that continually prioritizes funding wars in Iraq and Afghanistan while leaving the defense of our homeland at risk.

The Democratic Budget provides greater attention to improving military readiness, in particular for the National Guard and Reserve.

ADDITIONAL PAY AND BENEFITS TO THE TROOPS

The Democratic Budget calls for advanced pay and benefits to improve the quality of life of the troops and their families, including an emphasis on providing support and assistance to troops and their families while they are deployed and when they return from deployments to readjust to civilian life.

This is what we owe the Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines who have so selflessly fought for our Nation's freedom.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman.

I will conclude by saying that this is a solid budget that defends our Nation, supports a strong national defense, and just as importantly, honors in a meaningful way those who have risked their lives to defend our Nation, our veterans and our military retirees.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds only to say that this budget that's before us raises the national debt by \$646 billion this year, the largest annual increase ever. And that's \$14 trillion of unfunded debt to just two programs, Medicare and Social Security.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the vice ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, our friends on the other side of the aisle have spent a great deal of time over the past few years railing against deficits and railing against the debt. And last year, their first time in the majority in over a decade, the Democrats finally got

their chance to show their version of what a fiscally responsible Congress should actually look like. But all they've done since they've come into power is mismanage the fiscal situation.

The key to managing and to budgeting is to set priorities, and everyone who has ever had a family or run a business knows this. You have to make difficult choices, and you can't always have everything you want right when you want it.

But the Democrats have refused to set priorities. They simply want to spend more on everything and everyone within the reach of the Federal Government. And we've even seen things that they spend money on that the Federal Government has absolutely nothing to do with.

And to pay for all this new spending? Well, they're simply going to raise taxes, this time by \$683 billion. That tax hike lets them show balance, at least on paper, for this round of spending. But their plan to chase ever-higher spending with ever-higher taxes can only work for so long. Pretty soon, as their spending continues to spiral out of control without any priorities, without any effort to cut waste, and without any effort to reform entitlements, they're simply going to run out of people to pay for it all. Then what?

Again, budgeting is about setting priorities and making decisions. But the decisions this budget makes, and perhaps more importantly, those that it fails to make, sets up a vicious cycle of tax and spend that neither the budget nor the American taxpayer can sustain for long.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Chairman, I will yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the ranking member.

The Democrats' budget clearly shows, and depends on collecting, the largest increase in taxes in our Nation's history.

Most tax experts agree that one of the hallmarks of good tax policy is consistency and stability in that code. A high degree of uncertainty about future tax policy makes long-term planning difficult for both families and businesses, and that uncertainty can have a negative impact on economic growth, yet this majority continues to actively foster that uncertainty, again producing a budget that depends on the collection of the largest increase in taxes in American history.

Congress recently passed a bipartisan stimulus package that will give struggling families some of their tax dollars back with the hopes that they will spend this money and bolster our economy. But before they can even get these checks out the door, the Democrats have unveiled a budget that will take back all of that money, plus billions of dollars more. Do we really expect families to go out and spend

money when they've got a host of new income taxes that will dramatically decrease their discretionary income hanging over their heads?

Last year, the new Congress waited until the 11th hour to pass a 1-year AMT patch, in effect threatening more than 20 million Americans with an average tax hike of \$2,000. This AMT slow walk, according to the Treasury, has now forced 3 million taxpayers to delay filing their tax returns to collect child care, education, and energy credits.

If, as the Democrats claim, they actually intend to stick to their PAYGO rule from now on, and as an aside, last night's ethics bill completely ignored the PAYGO impact, Americans can expect to see their tax burdens rise to a level never seen before in our Nation. But just whose tax bills are going to explode, and when, we're not sure.

My point here is that, beyond the damage they will do when taxes actually go up in 2011, 2012 and 2013, the majority is doing a great disservice to American workers and businesses and our economy as a whole by maintaining this tax uncertainty. As a result, we have a whole Nation of workers and businesses with no idea of what their tax burden will look like in the future, let alone in this coming year. And I can't imagine too many folks going out and buying new refrigerators, or too many businesses investing, expanding and the creating new jobs necessary to get our economy back on track with that kind of uncertainty hanging over their heads.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Chairman, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, for as many shortcomings as this budget has for what it contains, the largest single tax increase in American history threatening, over the next few years, an increase in family taxes of over \$3,000 a year, an explosion of new government spending in bureaucracy, the largest Federal budget ever, earmarks as far as the eye can see, taking money out of paychecks so some Member of Congress can keep their paycheck, for as bad as this budget is for what it contains, it's even worse for what it doesn't contain.

□ 1600

There is nothing, nothing in this budget that will reform out-of-control entitlement spending. This budget, this Democrat budget, threatens the retirement security of future generations.

And don't take my word for it. Go to the Social Security and Medicare Trustees Report. It's going broke. It is going broke. The Nation can't afford all of the spending that the Democrats are putting forth. Already these programs are threatening future generations with an unconscionable tax hike. We are looking at a fiscal fork in the

road already so that future generations are either, A, going to have to have their taxes doubled, or there will be no Federal Government to speak of except Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Now, our friends on the other side of the aisle say, well, give us a few years and maybe we'll get around to doing something about it. Well, we don't have a few years. We don't have a few years, Mr. Chairman, because every single year that the Democrats choose to kick the can down the road, every single year they choose to ignore the problem, an extra \$2 trillion of debt that they decry is put on our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Chairman, I got into the parent business 6 years ago. I have a 6-year-old daughter and a 4-year-old son. I know many on that side of the aisle have children and grandchildren. So I'm so perplexed that they don't care about this problem. Every year they ignore it, it's an extra \$8,000 of debt or taxes that are going to be placed on our children and our grandchildren.

But don't take my word for it. Listen to the Federal Reserve: "Without early and meaningful action to address the rapid growth of entitlements, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened with future generations bearing much of the cost."

Comptroller General Walker: "The rising cost of government entitlements are a fiscal cancer, a fiscal cancer that threatens catastrophic consequences for our country and could bankrupt America."

Those aren't my words, Mr. Chairman. Those are the words of the Comptroller General. Those are the words of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

So right now already as the Democrats decry the current debt, do they not believe that Medicare is a debt of the government? Do they not believe Medicaid is a debt of the government? Do they not believe Social Security is a debt of the government? And if so, it is their budget, their budget that is increasing debt and heaping it upon future generations.

This \$8,000 a year that they are putting on future generations, that's enough money for every family in my district to send two children to Texas A&M University for 4 years. It will pay an average mortgage for 2 years. And yet, again, the Democrats know about this problem, Mr. Chairman; they just don't do anything about it.

Now, somebody who grew up listening to a lot of rock and roll, there's a song that I'm very fond of called "Ohio" by Neil Young, and there's a line in that song that says, "How can you run when you know?" And that's what I ask about this budget. How can the Democrats run when they know what they are doing to future generations?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, the ranking

member of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, our friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of saying that a budget is a moral document. It shows what we care about. I couldn't agree more.

The majority's bloated budget blueprint is a clear demonstration to families across America that the Democratic majority in Congress is intently focused on dipping its fingers into their pockets to take more and more of their hard-earned money. It shows that the Democratic majority will raise taxes, without hesitation, to support its addiction to spending. And it shows that Democrats in Congress are not interested in making difficult choices, setting priorities, or rooting out waste in government spending.

What we are considering today is the Democrat majority's "more, more, more resolution." More spending, more budget gimmicks, and more taxes.

As my colleagues well remember, we held the line on spending last year thanks solely to the President and Republicans in Congress. The President's budget requested this year \$59 billion, or a 6.3 percent increase, in discretionary spending over the present fiscal year. Most people would think \$59 billion is plenty, but it's not enough for the "more, more, more budget."

We hear our Democrat colleagues pay a great deal of lip service to the poor. But here's what failing to extend these tax cuts in the years ahead will do to the poor:

Six million low-income American families will no longer qualify for earned income tax credits;

Low-income families with one or two children will no longer be eligible for the refundable child tax credit;

Roughly 12 million single women with children will see their taxes increase by \$1,100 a year.

As disconcerting as all of this may be, the real 800-pound gorilla sitting in the corner of the room is the problem, and that is entitlement spending. Presently, mandatory spending and interest on the national debt consumes nearly two-thirds of the Federal budget, and it is rising at an alarming and unsustainable pace.

If we ignore the 800-pound gorilla, we are walking away from the dire needs, desperate needs, of the American public.

Mr. Chairman, our friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of saying that a budget is a moral document—it shows what we care about. I couldn't agree more.

The majority's bloated budget blueprint is a clear demonstration to families across America that the Democrat majority in Congress is intently focused on dipping its fingers into their pockets to take more and more of their hard-earned money. It shows that the Democrat majority will raise taxes—without hesitation—to support its addiction to spending. And, it shows that Democrats in Congress are not interested in making difficult choices, setting priorities, or rooting out waste in government spending.

What we are considering today is the Democrat majority's "More, More, More Budget Resolution"—more spending, more budget gimmicks, more taxes. For the first time in history, the discretionary budget that is being proposed by this majority will exceed one trillion dollars.

As my colleagues well remember, we held the line on spending last year thanks solely to the President and Republicans in Congress. In spite of the desire of our Democrat colleagues to spend far more, this Congress passed appropriations bills that totaled roughly \$933 billion in discretionary funding.

The President's budget requested a \$59 billion, or 6.3 percent, increase in discretionary spending over the present fiscal year. Most people would think that a \$59 billion increase in spending would be enough. But not this majority. They are proposing a whopping \$82 billion, or nine percent, increase over current year levels.

In addition to the tens of billions of additional taxpayer funds they're proposing to spend next year, this majority intends to play budget games and increase advance appropriations by another \$2 billion above what was provided this year.

The notion of advance appropriations is arcane budget talk so I'll try to break it down into real English. The majority is committing an additional \$2 billion in funding for next year—remember, we don't pay for it this year, we pay for it next year.

My colleague from New York, Mr. WALSH, correctly pointed out during consideration of the fiscal year 2008 Labor/HHS bill that advance funding is a dangerous proposition because if Congress does not keep providing at least the same level of advance funding year after year, drastic cuts will be needed to live within the allocations each appropriations subcommittee receives.

I want to address another troubling aspect of this budget proposal. We have heard—and will continue to hear—our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about how this budget cuts taxes. Nothing could be further from the truth. By failing to make permanent the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, this budget actually increases the tax burden on American citizens by \$683 billion over the next five years.

That's a pretty big number, but let me break this number down in a manner that makes sense to the average family sitting around their kitchen table. Under this budget, the average American family of four that earns \$50,000 per year will send an additional \$2,100 to Washington in 2011.

We hear our Democratic colleagues pay a great deal of lip service to the poor, but here's what failing to extend these tax cuts does to low-income Americans: 6 million low-income Americans will no longer qualify for the Earned Income Tax Credit; low-income families with one or two children will no longer be eligible for the refundable child tax credit; roughly 12 million single women with children will see their taxes increase by \$1,100 per year; and about 18 million seniors living on fixed incomes will be subjected to tax increases of more than \$2,100 per year.

As disconcerting as the rampant spending is, let's not lose sight of the fact that this budget ignores the 800-pound gorilla sitting in the corner of the room—entitlement spending. Presently, mandatory spending and interest on the national debt consumes nearly two-thirds

of the Federal budget and it is rising at an alarming, unsustainable pace.

In 1990, we spent the equivalent of \$893 billion of today's dollars on entitlement programs—mostly Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. Today we are poised to spend \$1.6 trillion on those same entitlements. For those who like to talk in percentages, that represents a 74 percent increase in inflation adjusted dollars. We ignore this sleeping giant at our own peril.

So my friends, let's ask ourselves this question: who will pay for this budget? The simple answer is our children and our grandchildren.

They will pay for it in the form of higher taxes because this budget refuses to make permanent the tax cuts enacted in 2001 and 2003 that spurred roughly 6 years of economic growth.

They will pay for it in the form of reduced future prosperity because Government will continue to spend and spend and spend.

They will pay for it because their Government would consume more and more of what they earn rather than allowing them to invest, create jobs, and improve their quality of life.

In short, Mr. Chairman, this "big government, Washington-knows-best" budget suggests that politicians and bureaucrats in Washington are better stewards of the public's money than the very families who send it here.

My advice to the American taxpayer is this: Hold onto your wallet because the big spenders in Congress are coming to take more of what you can earn.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject the majority's bloated budget resolution. It's time to put Uncle Sam on a diet.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the newest member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, for those Americans brave enough to be watching this proceeding right now on TV, I'd ask them to sit down because I have some shocking news to share with them. And here it is: The Federal Government spends a lot of money.

Big surprise; right?

How much money are we talking here? How about \$23,000 per year per household.

My guess is that with the exception of our military, it's tough for the average American to name one thing the Federal Government does well.

This budget proposes to spend more than \$3.1 trillion. That, Mr. Chairman, is not an easy thing to do. To reach \$3.1 trillion, the Federal Government will have to spend \$100,000 a second, 6 million bucks a minute, over 350 million bucks an hour every day for the next year. Whoever thought that Senator Dirksen's line about "a billion here, a billion there" would become outdated?

Mr. Chairman, we've heard of tax-and-spend politicians, but I believe it's spending that drives taxes. And reckless out-of-control spending has put us on a path for economic disaster.

And don't take my word for it. Ask outgoing Comptroller General David

Walker, who is sounding the alarm across the country about the unsustainable rate at which Congress is spending.

The American people instinctively know that Congress has an insatiable appetite for spending. They can see it. In terms of real dollars, Congress has quadrupled spending over my lifetime.

The question is, for what? Why do we need four times more Federal Government today than we did in 1964? It's not the military. Defense spending's impact on the budget has decreased by almost two-thirds in real dollars. This, while earmarks have skyrocketed and mandatory spending has grown tenfold.

The real change has been in the mindset. Simply put, Congress has grown to accept the "nanny state." Some Members of this body have grown accustomed to the numbers in this budget. But believe me, they are staggering to the American people, and the people of the Fourth District of Ohio. How staggering? What if, instead of spending \$23,000 per family, the Federal Government spent only \$20,000 per family? We could jump-start this economy with \$400 billion in tax cuts, and we could balance our budget virtually in 1 year.

Mr. Chairman, the sirens are blaring. The alarms are ringing. We need to answer the call and put our fiscal house in order. And we can start by voting "no" on the Democrat budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, 25 years ago I stood on this floor and didn't quote rock and roll but quoted a country singer called Johnny Paycheck and his famous song "Take This Job and Shove It." It was the lament of the working man imposed upon by many outside forces but predominantly the government's telling him what to do and taking his money. And here I am 25 years later, now a member of the Budget Committee, once again in the minority, and I hear the same thing from my good friends across the aisle: tax and spend, tax and spend, tax and spend, and pretend you're not doing it.

Let's be very clear about this budget. You can talk about everything else, but I would like to talk about one thing: taxes. Taxes. I didn't think you would be able to do it.

Mr. Chairman, last year we had the largest tax increase in the history of the United States, which means the largest tax increase in the history of the world, by the way. But they did themselves one better. This is even larger. This tax increase is \$683 billion. Now, that's not the total tax. That's the tax increase we're talking about. I really thought last year we would never see that topped, but we almost double it this year.

Now, what does this mean? When we were debating in the committee, I said,

and I must apologize for this to my constituents in California, that if adopted and implemented, the Democratic budget would impose on my California constituents an increase, average tax hike, of \$3,000. Well, I am corrected. I am corrected. It will actually give an increase, average tax hike, to Californians of \$3,331.

Luckily, my constituents don't live in Connecticut, because there they would get an average tax hike of \$4,311. This is the gift that keeps on giving, or I guess we should say keeps on taking.

So if you want to know if you can stand on the floor of the House and set a record, if you want to be the Olympic champion on steroids of taxes, vote for this budget. Vote for this budget.

Now, I understand if you're an adherent of Big Government, you need big taxes. So if you do believe that we don't have a large enough government, then vote for this budget, because it will increase the size of the Federal Government relative to local government, relative to State government, relative to the average taxpayer, relative to the rest of the world. It will break all records. The largest single tax increase in the history of the world, \$683 billion. Remember that number: \$683 billion.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, a member of the Budget Committee (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard and we know this budget has the largest tax increase in American history and it also doubles the deficit from what the last Republican budget was. But somehow the majority seems to want to convince us all that this is good for America.

Well, in considering that, I'm reminded of this commercial I see on TV, this guy named Matthew Lesko. Have you seen it? He wears this funny suit with these symbols on it, and they film it right out here on the west side of the Capitol. And he clearly makes a great living. He publishes books to tell people how to get their hands on government money. He says in the commercial: "Let Matthew Lesko be your guide to join the millions each year who get free money, grants, loans, giant contracts, and free assistance from the Federal Government."

Here are some of his book titles: "Free Money for Business"; "Free Money for a Better Home"; "Free Money to Pay Your Bills"; and, my personal favorite, "Free Money to Quit Your Job."

Now, the Democrats would have you believe that they're perpetuating with this budget the concept put forward in this commercial, that government money is free. But you know what? It's not. Because every dollar that the government sends out in free money to somebody is a dollar they took, this

government took, from some American who earned it or that this government borrowed from some American who has yet to earn it but will have to pay it back, plus interest, in the future.

The majority in this budget has refused to set priorities and, instead, is just spending everybody's money on everything and demanding more and more of that money that they would like to think of as free. But we all know every single dollar will eventually come from us.

□ 1615

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank Chairman SPRATT for his leadership and for his work on this budget. And I want to also thank his staff and my staff for really helping us put together I think a very good budget that we support.

This is a budget that, as compared to the Bush budget, I think the Bush budget is really the worst that we have seen in his long line of bad budgets. And with the staggering \$12 billion a month with regard to the cost of the occupation of Iraq, I think it is about \$3 trillion being projected, this is dragging our economy further into what we are calling an "Iraq recession."

It is particularly shameful that the administration would cut programs at this point in health care, in food assistance and in education which would help so many people who desperately need it right now.

That is why I am pleased that the Democratic budget before us rejects those draconian cuts. And I am also pleased that this budget is really war neutral. In fact, as the chairman stated earlier, the \$70 billion placeholder in this budget can be used for whatever policy the Congress eventually chooses in authorizing and appropriating legislation, including redeployment of our troops. Now, over 90 Members of Congress signed a letter to President Bush and said that we would not vote for one more dime for combat operations. Only we will vote for money to redeploy our young men and women and bring them home. So as we approach this fifth anniversary of the invasion and occupation of Iraq, it is far past time that we act on the will of the American people by doing exactly that.

So I want to thank the chairman for this budget. And I urge my colleagues to support this budget and to work quickly toward redeploying our troops, toward addressing the waste, fraud and abuse in the Pentagon budget and begin to bring our troops and our military contractors out of Iraq and refocus our efforts and our budget on the many domestic needs here at home, which this budget does.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. May I inquire how much time remains between the two sides.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. WEINER). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 60½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from South Carolina has 62 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will reserve.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget, which represents a down payment on our commitment to restore middle class prosperity. It offers a clear and practical approach to strengthen our economy in a way that helps our workforce thrive. It allows families to reach for that American Dream.

Today, the Bush economy continues to weigh heavily on America's families and businesses. Our Republican colleagues call for fiscal responsibility. That call is a sham. George Bush has added more to the Federal debt than every single President from George Washington to Ronald Reagan. And at the same time, median household income has dropped \$1,000. In the Clinton years, median income rose to \$6,100. Poor economic growth has left nearly 1.6 million more workers unemployed, and long-term unemployment is up by 62 percent. There are over 3.3 million fewer manufacturing jobs today than at the start of this administration. Incomes are flat while everything else goes up, gas prices, food prices, the cost of health care and education.

This is a budget that is strong. It gets us back to basics. It maintains fiscal discipline while making strong economic growth possible, benefiting all American families. It means crucial funding for the Democratic Innovation Agenda and reforms for our tax policy to reduce burdens on middle class families. It means rejecting the President's cuts to critical unemployment programs. Now is not the time to undermine already vulnerable communities. We can act to rebuild crumbling bridges, fix our roads, reduce congestion and make a serious investment in our infrastructure, paving the way for new growth and opportunity.

This budget makes real investments to help workers and create jobs in a fiscally responsible way. It is a budget that reaches balance in 2012. It reflects our priorities as a Nation and our belief that government has a commitment to its citizens to make critical investments in efficient and renewable energy sources, education, job training and health care, the foundation of a strong economy and future growth. It is about making our workforce more productive and making opportunity real. It is about staying competitive. And we share a mutual obligation to get it right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that this budget resolution rejects the many proposed cuts in public education

by the President. The President proposes in his budget to eliminate a total of 47 programs. They are vocational education programs. They are programs for people who repair our plumbing in our homes, who build our houses, who build our roads, who supply the electrical work that gets done, programs like the Perkins Loan cancellations, Even Start, mentoring efforts, and the Reading is Fundamental initiative.

The Spratt budget would also restore initiatives designed to improve teacher quality like Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow, Advanced Credentialing, and the Teacher Quality Enhancement initiative. If we are going to teach our children, let's have qualified people in the classroom. And it doesn't just automatically happen. It takes money. Industry will tell you that for every person they have, they spend a lot of money in investing in those people. And as the only former State school chief serving in this body, I am particularly pleased about the provision for education initiatives and innovations that have been included in the Spratt resolution.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This resolution provides greater investment in our Nation's schools, including school construction bonds. I have been working on this with Congressman RANGEL for almost 10 years. We need quality places for our children to go to school. And there's important investments in things like Head Start, special education for those who really have needs, and to provide more money to fully fund secondary education.

The chairman's mark also provides for funding for America COMPETES Act. What is this? It expands math and science education at the secondary level. That is in high school. We can't get them in the universities if we can't get them through high school. And Lord knows that in this economy, we need them. Education is the single most important investment that we can make in our future.

I support this budget resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote for it and support it.

I thank the gentlelady for this opportunity to speak.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman. You are right in terms of the resolution and its reflection on our priorities. Nothing could be more important than access to education and ensuring that our schools and our students have the resources to succeed.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) for engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The chairman's mark is \$6.9 billion above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level for education and \$7.1 billion above the President's request for education. And as a member of both the Budget Committee and the Education Committee, I am proud of that. And I think all of our colleagues should be proud of that. Mr.

ETHERIDGE just talked about the 47 programs that the President's budget cuts but that this budget resolution restores. I want to talk about just three of them.

The President's budget resolution or proposal cuts \$750 million out of the SEOG program, the Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant, fully eliminating the program. And it also eliminates the Perkins Loan revolving fund another \$750 million. That is \$1.5 billion on an annual basis taken out of the student loan delivery system. And that completely undercuts what this Congress, on a bipartisan basis, passed and enacted into law this fall when we passed the College Cost Reduction Act. So the Congress has gone on record as saying that the Federal Government needs to take a larger role in supporting student financial aid programs. And the President is ignoring that and, in fact, pushing us in the opposite direction. We need to push back and continue to fund those programs.

And the other is the Perkins Vocational Education program, \$1.2 billion, that the President again recommends be eliminated. These are job training programs. And at a time when we are hemorrhaging jobs, and at a time when we need to remain competitive globally, to take away job training programs makes absolutely no sense.

So I am proud that the budget resolution addresses these three vital areas. I am hopeful we will be able to appropriate the moneys to keep these funds going. And I thank the chairman for his leadership on this and many other important issues.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I thank him for his commitment.

You've said it well when you talk about investing in the next generation and you talk about our children being in a competitive marketplace and in a global economy. And what this budget does, as you actually stated, is it gives them the skills to compete in that competitive world. And again I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. BAIRD. I thank the gentlelady.

One of the things I am most proud of about this budget, and I want to commend Chairman SPRATT for his work on, is his emphasis on keeping America competitive. And I want to talk about two ways it does that.

First of all, as my colleagues have mentioned, it fully funds the America COMPETES Act. It provides funding allowances to make sure that we have adequately trained teachers in science and mathematics to make sure that we have research investments.

This morning, on the 50th anniversary of the creation of the Science Committee, we heard from Bill Gates, the CEO of Microsoft. Chairman Gates spoke about the absolutely essential importance of training the next gen-

eration of scientists and engineers and of funding critical basic research in applied sciences. If we want our economies to be strong, we must invest in science. This budget provides for that.

The other side, which my colleagues have also mentioned, is career and technical education. I am proud to have cofounded the Career and Technical Education Caucus in this Congress. And I can tell you if you talk to business people throughout this country, they will tell you they desperately need trained and skilled workers. The President's budget would zero out the Perkins grant program, which provides essential resources for our career and technical education programs. Our Democratic budget restores that funding. If you or your child want a job in a highly skilled profession, career and technical education can provide that. Our budget makes sure those programs have the resources needed.

I am proud to support this budget.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

And I just will reiterate that I think Mr. Gates has it right, and you have it right. It is about an innovation agenda, innovation and what our future is. We can't be stuck where we are. We need to deal with the resources that allow us to compete in a global economy, to have a competitive edge and look at the technology for the future, as well.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you. I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy.

It is a little frustrating to listen to our friends repudiate the legacy of Ronald Reagan and Dick Darman who believed in the PAYGO philosophy. These people feel that they cannot balance revenue and spending, and they don't even want to try. We heard them in our committee propose adjustments that would have added over \$1 trillion to the deficit.

This budget demonstrates the Democratic commitment to the environment, public health and livable communities in a fiscally sustainable fashion. This budget addresses the 7 years of cutting environmental programs and failing to address our energy needs and challenges of this country.

We reject the President's cuts to these programs and begin to reinvest in our public lands and domestic economy. This President's budget severely cuts important core environmental programs at a time when a third of our Nation's waters don't meet water quality standards and 150 million people live in areas that exceed EPA's air pollution standards. And the President's budget would provide some of the lowest levels of funding for clean water and drinking water revolving funds in their history, hurting communities' ability to meet their water infrastructure needs, which the EPA of the administration has estimated to be over a quarter of a billion dollars.

Finally, the President's budget cuts the USDA farm bill conservation programs which provide farmers with critical technical and financial assistance to reduce erosion, protect wildlife habitat and limit adverse impacts from agriculture on land and water.

Our budget rejects those cuts to natural resources environmental program. This provides 10 percent more to discretionary funding than the President's budget.

On the environment, over 5 years the chairman's mark is more than \$26 billion higher than the President's budget.

This budget accommodates the legislation that the House has passed three times to increase tax incentives for renewable energy and conservation. It rejects the President's cuts to research as well as weatherization assistance for low-income families to cut down on energy bills. Instead, this bill increases funding for energy efficient and renewable energy programs and vehicle technologies that move our economies forward.

□ 1630

Ms. DELAURO. Just to conclude, I do want to say a thank you to the gentleman from Oregon. The real progress that we can make in this budget does require the critical long-term investments in our local communities in energy and in infrastructure, in which the gentleman has been a leader, and that is all contained in this budget proposed by Chairman JOHN SPRATT. I thank the gentleman, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the Spratt budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Democrats' leadership may not want to admit that they are going to impose on our Nation's workers, on our taxpayers, on the small and mid-sized businesses of this country the largest tax increase in American history. But, regrettably, as this Democratic budget again proves, raising taxes is exactly not only what they have planned, but what they are doing in this budget, and it is important that taxpayers know what these massive tax hikes will mean to them, to you, to the American people. So, let's take a look at how this budget impacts the American people, the American family, the American taxpayer.

A family of four with \$50,000 in annual income would see a tax increase of over \$2,100, \$2,100 by 2011, as a result of this budget. That is a tax increase of 191 percent.

Forty-eight million married couples. So listen up, if you are one of those 48 million. Chances are you are. Forty-eight million married couples will see their tax bills rise by an average of \$3,000.

Twelve million single women with dependents will face a tax increase of nearly \$1,100.

Eighteen million seniors, 18 million seniors, will see a tax increase of more than \$2,100 by 2011.

Twenty-seven million small business owners, who are the backbone of our national economy that create the jobs, will see their taxes increase by over \$4,000.

More than 6 million low-income taxpayers, yes, 6 million low-income taxpayers who previously paid no Federal income tax, because of the changes in the Tax Code due to the elimination of the 10 percent tax rate, will see a huge tax increase.

These are just a few of the examples of what this budget does. I respectfully ask Members to oppose this budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), a member of the budget committee.

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Last year our friends on the other side of the aisle declared that they were going to "clean up the swamp" and get rid of the budget and its rampant waste, fraud, and abuse. In December of 2005, Speaker PELOSI proudly said, "The budget is a statement of national priorities and our values as a Nation."

Well, sadly, the Democrat values represented in this budget are waste, fraud, and abuse. It is very sad. But for my district, Mr. Chairman, this budget represents an average tax increase per taxpayer of \$2,631 per year. Additional loss of income in a number of studies, because rising taxes will curb economic growth, an additional loss of \$1,600. This budget is harmful to American values and American families.

I asked my Democrat colleagues to justify this for me. Why must we raise taxes by this rate? And yet nothing. I would be happy to yield to my colleagues to answer that question, why rising taxes are good for the American people. I hear nothing. I am willing to yield, but they have nothing. And what for? Waste, fraud, and abuse. Rising taxes. A government that is so large, and yet nothing is done to reform.

There are thousands of ways that we can eliminate this rampant growth of government. There are 91 programs that the administration targeted for elimination; 85 of them continue to be funded. In fact, half of them had increased funding last year under this Democratic Congress.

But what else is egregious, if you look at a Treasury Department report, you will find a section called "Unreconciled Transactions." Well, they account for \$25 billion worth of taxpayer funding that they know it was spent, but they don't know who, what, when, where, how, or why it was spent. This is rather disturbing.

We have the opportunity to right-size government, to reform government. When the U.S. Department of Education bureaucrats in these beautiful buildings down the street here, when

they have an average wage of \$93,000 a year, yet our average teacher in America only makes \$47,000 a year, we know these values are wrong in this Democrat budget. I asked my Democrat colleagues to justify this. Yet nothing. I hear nothing.

Mr. SPRATT. If the gentleman wants to yield, I will gladly respond to his question. The gentleman keeps throwing these rhetorical questions.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina controls the time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Instead of making the government bigger, we need to right-size government and reform government. Rather, this Democrat budget represents the efficiency and effectiveness of FEMA, the customer service of the IRS, and the real thoughtful approach of our immigration policy. And they want to expand these things. We need immigration reform. We need to reform government. We need to make sure we right-size government rather than expand this and grow it, which is what this Democrat budget does.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican alternative budget for fiscal year 2009. Overall, the Republican budget is \$95.6 billion, the Democratic budget is \$94.6 billion, and the President's mark is \$93.6 billion.

Our budget will provide \$49.2 billion in discretionary funding for veterans health care and programs. This is \$2 billion above the administration's overall request and it is \$1 billion over the Democrats' budget, and we do all of this without a \$683 billion tax hike.

Out of the \$49.2 billion in discretionary, \$44.2 billion is medical care for FY 09. The House Republicans would provide nearly \$1 billion more than the President's request. Included in that: We have about \$213 million for mental health care; we increase \$200 million more for improving health care to rural veterans; \$150 million more on long-term care; \$50 million more on medical care for veterans for OEF and OIF; we have \$50 million more on dental care, which we also ought to be billing the Army for providing a lot of this. We also have \$50 million more than the administration for polytrauma care and for caring for veterans with brain injury, i.e., traumatic or mild.

Republicans would also provide nearly \$100 million more than the administration's request for medical and prosthetic research. We also add an additional \$300 million for medical facilities and nonrecurring maintenance.

Mr. Chairman, to assist in the decreasing of the claims backlog and increased cybersecurity, we increase \$200

million for the Office of Information Technology. Part of this money we are investing in funding to create rules-based adjudication systems for the veterans disability compensation claims.

The alternative also includes increases over the President's level in all funding categories, including the Office of Inspector General, grants for State cemeteries and extended care facilities and the National Cemetery Administration, among others.

Now, when we look at what the Democrat budget is doing, we have got a tax increase. This tax increase would hit middle-income veterans and their families, veterans who are low-income earners, and veterans who own small businesses. However, the Republican alternative would increase spending for veterans by \$1 billion more than the Democrat budget, and we do this without increasing taxes on veterans.

I also would like everyone to note that I noticed, when I was back in my office watching the floor debate, there was a lot of waving going around of VSO letters. Well, the VSO letters, I think they would also love this Republican budget, because we increased veterans spending \$1 billion more than the Democrats.

We also need to remember this: The very same Democrat majority this past year in the committee voted to cut \$1 billion in veterans benefits. They did this on a party-line vote. They voted to cut \$1 billion of veterans benefits, from who? From wartime disabled, elderly, and indigent veterans. So if you want to talk about who is going to stand for veterans, just go look at the vote in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. They cut \$1 billion.

Chet, that hurts. I know it is tough for you to defend. You didn't do it, and I know you will not stand for it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a senior Member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to this, the largest tax increase on the American family in history. The average New Jersey taxpayer under this plan will see their tax increase by over \$3,700. That is the second highest increase of any State in the Union under this budget. With property taxes in my State soaring out of control and the high cost of living in New Jersey, the last thing any member from the New Jersey delegation should want to do is to drastically increase the Federal taxes on New Jersey families, as the Democrat budget now does.

What about jobs? In an independent analysis by the Heritage Foundation for the Fifth District that I represent, we will lose 2,000 jobs due to this tax increase.

So I hope that everyone who is watching this debate will pay attention

very closely to see how their Member from their State will vote, because if they vote in favor of this, they will see their taxes go up by around four grand in the future.

Last week, the day this budget was passed in committee, we had one of those late nights. It began around 10:30 in the morning; it ended a little after midnight. During that time, almost 30 amendments were tried by our side of the aisle, and almost every one of them was voted "no" and defeated by the Democrat side of the aisle.

Now, because that debate went so late in the evening, let me recap some of those, which I think was an intriguing debate that we had. I would like to go through and highlight a number of commonsense, good government initiatives that the Democrats voted against on every one.

One, Democrats unanimously voted against totally repealing the AMT.

Two, Democrats unanimously voted against all attempts to rescue Social Security and Medicare and make these and other programs sustainable for future generations.

Third, Democrats unanimously voted against eliminating air-drop earmarks and dedicating \$1 billion, that was just indicated, for veterans programs.

Democrats also remain committed, apparently, to eliminating the 10 percent bracket for low-income individuals and raising taxes on families by \$500 per child and reinstating the marriage penalty and reimposing the death tax.

The Democrats also unanimously voted against protecting the Social Security surplus. Instead, what they did, they chose to raid that fund simply to pay for more of their earmarks.

Democrats also unanimously voted against strengthening PAYGO. Instead, they preserved gaping holes that allow them to scam the system with the rules that maintain the guise of fiscal responsibility.

Democrats also unanimously voted against putting the House Members on record every time they vote to increase the debt.

Even more astoundingly, Democrats unanimously voted against their own legislation, a leading Blue Dog reform bill that would have required greater transparency and accountability in the budget process. Instead, what do they do, as with so many other good things, they put this commonsense idea off to another day.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want the American people to realize and understand that the Democrat members of the committee unanimously voted against all the proposals I just mentioned. They had the chance to improve this legislation. They refused to do so. And I encourage all of my colleagues to vote against this terrible budget and the largest tax increase burden on the American family.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from Texas, a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support the priorities of the Republican budget to control spending and keep taxes low. I commend the Budget Committee ranking member, PAUL RYAN, for putting together a budget alternative that prevents expansion of the alternative minimum tax for 3 years and then achieves repeal of this tax system in 2013.

This is a huge step in modernizing the Tax Code, and it will give Americans certainty about their tax situation. The Democrat budget only puts the AMT on a leash for 1 year before allowing it to ravage more American families.

□ 1645

Our Republican budget would also ensure that American families continue to be free of the stupidity of the marriage penalty and that families get to keep tax credits for children. Finally, our budget would continue to help make sure that investment in American capitalism and jobs will continue to thrive by allowing the tax rate on dividends and long-term capital gains to stay at the 15 percent rate.

The Democrat budget would raise taxes on my constituents by \$2,669. I don't see how we can support that. We balance the budget by 2012 by putting spending under control. It's important to know that total government spending does rise every year of the American budget, but there will be a lot of people claiming that we are actually cutting spending. Only in Washington can more spending be translated as a cut.

We pick and choose programs to cut by millions of dollars, and there are spending priorities that would get more money. That's what we are paid to do here in the Capitol, set priorities for what's important to the Nation.

Republicans in our budget take on the big issue of entitlement reform. I am very disappointed that the Democrat budget fails to seriously address the pending crisis in our country's entitlement programs. Congress has been warned many times that an entitlement reform is needed now. You would think the countless reports, testimonies and letters sent to Congress would get the attention of the majority. But if you look at their budget, you will see only the real action on reforming Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid is to kick the can down the road.

The cost is roughly \$14 trillion. By refusing to make the tough decisions on how to resolve the serious financial trouble these programs are facing, the Democrats have decided to leave those decisions to someone else.

Medicare and Medicaid need real reform to stop the slippery slope these programs are currently on. We cannot tweak the edges and make small changes and expect dramatic results.

We need to take a look at some real success stories in Medicare and Medicaid and see how we can apply the lessons.

For example, independent actuaries again this year have announced that the projected costs for Medicare part D will be lower than expected. Beneficiaries have enjoyed premiums that are 40 percent lower than original estimates. Compare that to the fact that part B premiums have doubled in price over the last 6 years.

The Republican budget is a better proposal. I suggest you vote for it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEINER, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 316

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, March 13, 2008, or Friday, March 14, 2008, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, March 31, 2008, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, March 13, 2008, through Friday, March 28, 2008, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, March 31, 2008, or such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the

time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules with regard to House Resolution 936 and S. 2733.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 204, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—211

Abercrombie	Doggett	Levin
Ackerman	Doyle	Lewis (GA)
Allen	Edwards	Lipinski
Altmire	Ellison	Loeb
Andrews	Emanuel	Lofgren, Zoe
Arcuri	Engel	Lowey
Baca	Eshoo	Lynch
Baird	Etheridge	Mahoney (FL)
Baldwin	Farr	Maloney (NY)
Becerra	Fattah	Markey
Berkley	Filner	Matsui
Berman	Foster	McCarthy (NY)
Berry	Frank (MA)	McCollum (MN)
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez	McDermott
Bishop (NY)	Gordon	McGovern
Blumenauer	Green, Al	McIntyre
Boren	Green, Gene	McNulty
Boswell	Grijalva	Meek (FL)
Boucher	Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)
Boyd (FL)	Hare	Melancon
Boyd (KS)	Harman	Michaud
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Miller, George
Brown, Corrine	Hill	Mollohan
Butterfield	Hinchey	Moore (KS)
Capps	Hinojosa	Moore (WI)
Capuano	Hirono	Moran (VA)
Cardoza	Hodes	Murphy (CT)
Carney	Holden	Murphy, Patrick
Castor	Holt	Murtha
Chandler	Honda	Nadler
Clarke	Hoyer	Napolitano
Clay	Inslee	Neal (MA)
Cleaver	Israel	Obey
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Cohen	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Conyers	(TX)	Pallone
Cooper	Jefferson	Pascarella
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Pastor
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Paul
Courtney	Jones (NC)	Payne
Cramer	Jones (OH)	Perlmutter
Crowley	Kagen	Peterson (MN)
Cuellar	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Cummings	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Davis (AL)	Kildee	Rahall
Davis (CA)	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kind	Richardson
Davis, Lincoln	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez
DeFazio	Kucinich	Ross
DeGette	Lampson	Rothman
DeLauro	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
	Lee	Salazar

Sánchez, Linda T.	Snyder	Visclosky
Sanchez, Loretta	Solis	Walz (MN)
Sarbanes	Spratt	Wasserman
Schakowsky	Stark	Schultz
Schiff	Stupak	Waters
Schwartz	Sutton	Watson
Scott (GA)	Tanner	Watt
Scott (VA)	Tauscher	Waxman
Serrano	Taylor	Weiner
Sestak	Thompson (CA)	Welch (VT)
Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Sherman	Tierney	Wilson (OH)
Sires	Towns	Wu
Skelton	Tsongas	Wynn
Slaughter	Udall (NM)	Yarmuth
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	
	Velázquez	

NAYS—204

Aderholt	Fox	Moran (KS)
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Murphy, Tim
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Musgrave
Bachmann	Gallagher	Myrick
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Nunes
Barrow	Giffords	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Gilchrest	Pence
Barton (TX)	Gillibrand	Peterson (PA)
Bean	Gingrey	Petri
Biggert	Gohmert	Pickering
Bilbray	Goode	Pitts
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Poe
Blackburn	Graves	Porter
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Bonner	Hayes	Putnam
Bono Mack	Heller	Radanovich
Boozman	Hensarling	Ramstad
Boustany	Herger	Regula
Brady (TX)	Hereth Sandlin	Rehberg
Broun (GA)	Hobson	Reichert
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Jordan	Roskam
Calvert	Keller	Royce
Camp (MI)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	King (NY)	Sali
Cannon	Kingston	Saxton
Cantor	Kirk	Schmidt
Capito	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Carter	Knollenberg	Sessions
Castle	Kuhl (NY)	Shadegg
Chabot	LaHood	Shays
Coble	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cole (OK)	Latham	Shuler
Conaway	LaTourette	Shuster
Crenshaw	Latta	Simpson
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY)	Linder	Smith (TX)
Davis, David	LoBiondo	Souder
Davis, Tom	Lucas	Space
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Dent	E.	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack	Terry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Thornberry
Donnelly	Marchant	Tiahrt
Doolittle	Matheson	Tiberi
Drake	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Dreier	McCaul (TX)	Upton
Duncan	McCotter	Walberg
Ehlers	McCrery	Walden (OR)
Ellsworth	McHenry	Walsh (NY)
Emerson	McHugh	Wamp
English (PA)	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McMorris	Weller
Fallin	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Feeney	McNerney	Whitfield (KY)
Ferguson	Mica	Wilson (NM)
Flake	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Wittman (VA)
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Fossella	Mitchell	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Carnahan	Marshall	Tancred
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Udall (CO)
Hooey	Rangel	Woolsey
Issa	Renzi	Young (AK)
Kennedy	Rush	